

healthcare providers intended to limit abortion access.

In Nevada and across the country, the vast majority of voters believes that women should get to make their own decisions about their reproductive health, including when and whether to have a child. We cannot let a dedicated minority take that right away from the rest of us.

Let me just say, I am going to keep working on this issue because it is so important to Nevadans and to women all over this country. This is about making sure that women can control their own bodies and their futures, and I will always stand up for that.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON ANDERSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired on the Anderson nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Anderson nomination?

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 393 Ex.]

#### YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	

#### NAYS—44

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeben	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Burr	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Portman	Young
Grassley	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Crapo	Moran
--------	-------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is con-

sidered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### REDUCE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to talk a moment about my REDUCE Act, which is the act to reduce plastic pollution, of which we have a lot.

Humans have created 8 billion tons of plastic, and it is all over the place. It is in our water. It is in our rivers. It is in our food. The Presiding Officer is from Colorado. As he knows, there was a study done that tested the rain falling in Colorado that showed that there were microplastics in the raindrops in Colorado.

So we have a plastics problem, and this is a bill whose intention is to solve that plastics problem.

I want to have you think about three numbers while I am making this speech: 2 percent, 10 percent, and 2050; 2 percent, 10 percent, and 2050.

What is 2 percent? Two percent is how much recycled plastic the plastics industry uses in single-use, disposable, throwaway plastic.

We had a hearing in the Environment and Public Works Committee, led by Chairman CARPER. We had witnesses in who were experts. They said it is actually less than 2 percent. So the plastics industry is comfortable with a business model in which they are only using recycled plastic for less than 2 percent of their production of single-use, disposable stuff.

They will then say: Well, yeah, but we don't need to worry about that because then it goes into the recycling bin.

Well, first of all, that is not much help if you are only going to use 2 percent recycled plastic in your plastic manufacturing and then 98 percent is all new fossil fuel-based plastic.

But here we get to the second number, 10 percent. When you put plastic in that blue bin and send it out to be recycled, less than 10 percent of that plastic actually gets recycled. Some people have said 6 percent. Some people have said 8 percent. Some people have said 9 percent. But pretty much everybody agrees that less than 10 percent of what you put in the recycling bin to recycle ever gets recycled. And the plastics industry is cool with that too.

The plastics industry is cool with 2 percent recycling content in their throughput, in their supply, and they are comfortable with 90 percent or more of your recycled plastics sent out in the blue bins never being recycled.

This brings me to the third number, 2050. Twenty-fifty is the year which, on present trends, will produce the following state of affairs: There will be more waste plastic floating in the Earth's oceans by mass than there will be living fish. That is the trajectory we are on with an industry that is totally content to use only 2 percent recycled plastic in its production and to have

the recycling system recycle less than 10 percent of the plastic that goes in. That is where we end up by 2050. And if we are content in this room to confer on our children and grandchildren a world in which there is more waste plastic floating around than there is living fish, then shame on us.

This is a trajectory we have to change, and my bill will change it. But, of course, the plastic industry doesn't love this. They are happy with using only 2 percent recycled plastic in their production. They are happy with less than 10 percent of recycled plastic in the blue bin ever getting recycled. They don't seem to give a red hot damn about the trajectory we are on with where we are going to be with waste plastic in the oceans. But they obviously care a lot about the bill because if you lived in Washington, DC, and you got the Washington Post on Wednesday, September 22, you got this little gem tucked in your newspaper on the front. It is a very glossy, multicolored handout, and it says:

Stop the plastic tax. Keep everyday goods affordable.

And then it shows a whole bunch of everyday goods: a bicycle helmet, reusable plastic containers that you use in your refrigerator to put stuff away when you are putting it back in the fridge, sneakers, a plastic child's toy, and a baby diaper.

Not one of those things is covered by our plastics tax—not one of them—not personal hygiene products like a diaper and not multiuse products like a child's toy or a sneaker or a bicycle helmet or the plastic containers that you store stuff in in your refrigerator.

If you flip it over, they go at it even further. There is a child's baby seat. There is solar paneling. There is a toothbrush. There is a cellphone. And there is a little package of tomatoes in Saran wrap in one of those foam Styrofoam containers.

The one thing on this whole page that this plastics pollution fee would touch is that disposable bit of foam. And if you would rather have that in the ocean instead of being recycled, fine; vote against this bill. But if you would like to see that kind of junk get properly disposed of, you need to support the act.

So why do you think the industry got this so wrong? Bicycle helmets, children's toys, car seats, toothbrushes? Do you think they actually didn't know what was in the bill or is it possible that they are just lying about the bill? And what conclusion do you draw when an industry is lying about a piece of legislation? The conclusion that I draw is that they know they would lose if they argued on the truth, and so they lie.

And they spent a lot of money on this. This is, you know, glossy. This is multicolor. We in politics, we send out mailers. This is not inexpensive. You put this onto every Washington Post—that is a big deal. They flooded the DC metropolitan area with this glossy pack of lies.

So let's just take a quick look at some of the stuff that they have been saying. Their myth is that the REDUCE Act affects all plastic products. No. Read the bill. It is a fee on single-use plastics that targets the fossil fuel companies that make the fossil fuel feedstock for those single-use disposable plastic products.

All you have to do is read the bill to see that. I don't know how we could make that any clearer. We specifically exempt anything other than single-use disposable plastics.

Further, if it is a single-use disposable plastic that is used in healthcare, that is used in hospitals, in patient treatments, we understand that; we exempt that too. It is the plastic spoons and the straws and the wrapping and the foam containers and all the rest of that junk that you can walk down any beach in America and see; that is the junk we are trying to see gets properly recycled by charging a fee on the people who are throwing this stuff out into the environment and not recycling it—or at least 98 percent not recycling it.

Here is the other myth: The REDUCE Act disadvantages U.S. businesses; we will fail in international competition if we do this.

Not true. If you are importing plastic, you have to pay just the same way as if you used U.S.-made plastic. This is a fee on plastic that touches the U.S. economy if it is going to be single-use disposable, and we are going to need to think about recycling it. It applies to any company doing business in the United States and imports from foreign companies. So that is another made-up myth.

And the last one, which is really—maybe it is designed to annoy me, but it is that the fee on plastics to encourage recycling would actually harm our climate; that this is an anti-climate piece of legislation.

The fact of the matter is that by the middle of the century, plastics will account for about a quarter of global oil consumption. This is what the fossil fuel industry is banking on for its future as we start driving electric cars that are nicer than internal combustion cars and cheaper and easier to maintain.

By 2030, greenhouse gas emissions from new plastics production will reach 1.3 billion tons—1.3 billion tons—which is equivalent to running 300 coal-fired powerplants. That doesn't sound to me much like sustainability.

This REDUCE Act is a fair and sensible and effective response to plastic pollution that is filling up our oceans, our rivers, and even our raindrops. The costs will be paid by the fossil fuel industry where the profit is made.

And by the way, when they try to push that cost down to consumers, good luck, ExxonMobil, telling Coca-Cola: We are raising our prices to you. Coca-Cola and all of its beverage companies have got pretty significant market clout, and they might just say: Not so fast, pal; you eat that cost. This is your mess; you clean it up.

Anyway, it is a good discussion to have because 2 percent of the plastics stream being recycled, 10 percent or less of plastic in the blue bins ever actually being recycled, and an ocean that has equal parts waste plastic and fish in it by 2050 is not acceptable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### TAXES

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about the massive tax increases that are being proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and by the Biden administration and by the Democrats in the House as a way to pay for this big, new spending package—\$3.5 trillion is what it is advertised as, although some say that, if you do the full 10-year calculation, it is more like \$5 trillion. But it is a lot of money, and the way it is paid for is by a huge increase in taxes. It is the biggest tax increase, actually, we are told, in over 50 years.

And I have been on the floor talking about this a few different times, and I talked about the impact on the economy, generally. I talked about the impact on our competitiveness internationally, which we finally fixed in 2017, which was really a bipartisan idea to go to a different kind of system, and it has worked so well.

But today I want to talk about another sector of our economy that is going to be hit really hard by these taxes, and that is small businesses, the backbone of our economy where most people work. Specifically, I want to focus on how these small businesses are going to be hurt by the specific tax issues that are being proposed.

Small businesses are generally defined as having 500 or fewer employees and make up about 99 percent of our companies in America. There are some really big companies, but when you look at the small businesses, they are, by far, the vast majority of our businesses—about 32 million of them. They employ over half of the U.S. workforce, and they account for nearly two-thirds of all jobs created in the United States since 2000. Now, that is according to the Small Business Administration.

So more than half the employees are there, but they actually are responsible for creating more jobs than big businesses. Think about it. Small businesses are more agile. It tends to be the startup businesses. It tends to be businesses that are hiring more people. So small business is really important. It is the backbone to our economy.

I grew up in one of those small businesses. When I was a kid, my dad left his job as a salesman for a bigger company, where he had healthcare and the benefits that come with that. And he sort of put it all at risk to start his own business.

He started off with five employees. My mom was the bookkeeper. They lost money the first few years, like a lot of small businesses do, but he hung in there. And my brother worked there

and my sister worked there and I worked there. I worked on the shop's floor. I did the maintenance.

It was a lift truck—forklift truck dealership, so we would grind down the lift trucks and paint them. And I learned how not just to work hard but learned how a small business can succeed. And it is not easy.

After losing money the first few years, my dad found his niche and became a successful small business. My brother later took the business to an even higher level, but it was still a small business that struggled depending on what was happening in the economy, external factors they couldn't control, like every small business.

It gave me a firsthand look as to how difficult it is and how important it is, both, to have small businesses out there. My dad was absolutely committed to ensuring the people who worked there felt like they were part of it, so he had a profit-sharing plan. It didn't work too well when there was no profit, but once there was profit, it worked pretty well. And there were guys who turned a wrench their whole career, lift truck technicians whom I have known my whole life, who are about my age, who are retiring today with a nice nest egg because of that profit-sharing plan and, then later, a 401(k). So I have seen what small businesses can do for their employees, for the local economy, for the broader community.

During COVID-19, small businesses have really struggled. It has been tough. They have been stretched really thin. As I am sure is the case with every single one of my colleagues here in the U.S. Senate, I have heard from a lot of small business owners across my home State of Ohio who have told me about the issues that they faced due to shutdowns, due to people being sick, due to the very difficult job right now of just getting workers to come to the business and to stay in the business. Workforce problems are the No. 1 issue I now hear about back home.

And due to the supply chain disruptions, taking longer and longer to get products and products having a higher and higher price due to the inflation that is reflected in that, it is tough right now. Despite these hardships, a lot of the small businesses I know have made it a real priority to ensure they are taking care of their people.

We helped them do that here through the PPP program, the Paycheck Protection Program. I strongly support it because I have seen it work. I have seen employees be able to stick around through the worst of COVID and now be able to come back to work.

We have got another surge going on right now in my home State and around the country with the Delta variant, but we are learning better how to keep people at work and how to ensure that folks are taken care of. Often these small business owners have done this out of their own pockets; in other words, they have lost money during the